



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/511,025	04/28/2005	Jesus Moleiro Mirabal	CLAIM-2004002	8755
46345	7590	01/24/2008	EXAMINER	
AXIOS LAW GROUP, PLLC 1525 FOURTH AVENUE SUITE 800 SEATTLE, WA 98101			CUTLIFF, YATE KAI RENE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1621		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/24/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/511,025	MIRABAL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yate' K. Cutliff	1621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 November 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 22-24 in the reply filed on November 28, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Claims 22-34 are improperly encased within square brackets "[]". Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear what "...fat volume relation between 100 and 500" is referring to.
Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kingzette et al. (U.S. 247,789) and Washuttle et al. (U.S. 5,183,911).

The rejected claims cover, *inter alia*, a process for obtaining ozonized oils and fats in a bubbling reactor, characterized by the ozonation in liquid phase of an emulsion of water in vegetable oil or fat, in a 1 - 50 % relation in volume, by passing the ozone-oxygen or ozone-air gas mixtures through it, at a controlled temperature between 30 - 50 °C, employing a gas flow / vegetable oil or fat volume relation between 100 and 500, and using as quality parameters: peroxide (PI) and acid (AI) indexes, and/or concentration of aldehydes and/or viscosity. Further, the vegetable oil or fat α -hydroxi-hydroperoxides are formed with a PI between 200-1200 units.

Kingzett et al. disclosed a process for the production antiseptics and disinfectants the use Turpentine or rosin-spirit, or any essential oil or hydrocarbon which contains a terpene or which contains a cymene, expose it to the action of atmospheric oxygen or pure oxygen in the presence of water, yielding peroxide of hydrogen. (see column 1, lines 22-30). The oil under goes oxidation and contains a very active organic peroxide. (see column 2, lines 52-56). In the process the reaction vessel may be charged with 30 gallons of turpentine and 60 gallons of water, the temperature of 140°F (60°C) with the air blown or drawn through. (see column 3, lines 1-25).

Kingzette et al. fails to explicitly disclose the gas flow/vegetable oil or fat volume relation; use of quality parameters; and hydroxi-hydroperoxides PI (peroxide index) between 200 and 1200 units.

Washuttl et al. disclosed a process for the production of stable ozonized oils by bubbling ozone-oxygen mixture through unsaturated vegetable oils such as olive oil, sunflower seed oil etc. (see column 2, lines 1-16). In the process of Washuttle et al.

one to two liters per minute of oil are treated with a continuous run-through gas with the ozone concentration being in the range of fifty to seventy micrograms per milliliter. (See column 2, lines 43-49). Washuttle et al. uses quality parameters for determination of the peroxide coefficient. (see column 3, lines 1-7). In Example 1, the product obtained by the process has a peroxide coefficient of 929.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to bubbling ozone-oxygen mixture or ozone-air gas through a water vegetable oil emulsion, as suggested by Applicant and have a reasonable expectation of success as suggested by Applicant, and produce the instant invention, ozonized oils and fats.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because of the success of Kingzett et al and Washuttle et al. performing substantially identically process and obtaining organic peroxides.

Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yate' K. Cutliff whose telephone number is (571) 272-9067. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on (571) 272 - 0871. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yaté K. Cutliff
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 1621
Technology Center 1600



Samuel Barts
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1600